THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.ESWARAIAH

W.P.No.7350 of 2006

Dt.17.4.2006

Between:

Seemakurty Venkatraju … Petitioner

And

The Municipal Corporation of Kakinada,
Rep. By its Commissioner, Kakinada and
another
…Respondents

ORDER:

Petitioner questions the impugned action of the respondents in widening the roads by demolishing the building of the petitioner bearing D.No.28-1-16/1, Main Road, Kakinada, East Godavari District, without any notification, without paymet of any compensation and without initiating any action under the provisions of Sections 146 and 147 of the Hyderabad Municipal Corporations Act, 1955 or under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act or by private negotiations as illegal and arbitrary.

Petitioner is the owner and peaceful possessor of the building bearing D.No.28-1-

16/1, Main Road, Kakinada, East Godavari District. While so, the first respondent Municipal Corporation has taken up road widening programme and marked the effected portion of the buildings and structures on either side of the roads to an extent of 15 to 17 feet.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the standing counsel on behalf of the respondents.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents without issuing any notice and without initiating any proceedings and without paying any compensation trying to demolish the building of the petitioner for widening of road. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the action of the respondents without following the due procedure prescribed under law and without paying any compensation either by way of private negotiations or by way of initiating proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 is utter violation of the principles of natural justice as well as Sections 146 or 147 of the Hyderabad Municipal Corporations Act, 1955 (for short 'the Act').

No doubt widening/laying of the road is in the public interest but while laying the road, if any property of private individual is coming in the way, it is for the respondents to acquire the same either by way of initiating land acquisition proceedings or by following due process of law. This Court disposed of number of writ petitions directing the respondents not to demolish the property of the private citizens without following due process of law.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, this writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents not to demolish the structures or take away any portion of the property of the petitioner without following due process of law either under Sections 146 or 147 of the Act or by private negotiations or by initiating the proceedings under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. No costs.

V.ESWARAIAH, J.

April 17, 2006.

kpr